

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Addiese: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P O Box 1450 Alexandra, Virginia 22313-1450 www.wepto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. | |
|--------------------------------------|--------------------------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|--|
| 10/600,472 | 06/19/2003 | Lance Peterson | 005220.P006 | 6337 | |
| 66701 RED HAT/BS | 7590 09/16/200 TZ | EXAMINER | | | |
| BLAKELY SOKOLOFF TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP | | | NGUYEN, THUONG | | |
| | AD PARKWAY E. CA 94085-4040 | | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER | |
| | , | | 2455 | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | MAIL DATE | DELIVERY MODE | |
| | | | 09/16/2009 | PAPER | |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

| Application No. | Applicant(s) | | |
|------------------|-----------------|--|--|
| 10/600,472 | PETERSON ET AL. | | |
| Examiner | Art Unit | | |
| Thuong T. Nguyen | 2455 | | |

| | Thuong T. Nguyen | 2455 | |
|--|---|---|--|
| The MAILING DATE of this communication appe | ars on the cover sheet with the o | correspondence add | ress |
| THE REPLY FILED 01 September 2009 FAILS TO PLACE THIS | S APPLICATION IN CONDITION F | OR ALLOWANCE. | |
| A The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appe for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods: | replies: (1) an amendment, affidavi | t, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or | hich places the (3) a Request |
| a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing | | | |
| b) A The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire te Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f) | ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE | date of the final rejection | n. |
| Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date in avae been filled is the date for purposes of determining the period of ext under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). | ension and the corresponding amount of hortened statutory period for reply origing than three months after the mailing date | of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Office | ate extension fee e action; or (2) as |
| NOTICE OF APPEAL | lianna with 27 CER 41 27 must be 4 | Clad within two wonths | of the date of |
| The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed wi | sion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to | avoid dismissal of the | appeal. Since a |
| AMENDMENTS | | | |
| The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, to | | | cause |
| (a) They raise new issues that would require further cor | | ΓE below); | |
| (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below | | de la companya de la | |
| (c) They are not deemed to place the application in beti appeal; and/or | ter form for appeal by materially rec | auding or simplifying ti | ie issues for |
| (d) They present additional claims without canceling a c | corresponding number of finally reje | ected claims. | |
| NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)). | | | |
| The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12 | See attached Notice of Non-Cor | mpliant Amendment (I | PTOL-324). |
| Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): | | | |
| Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s). | owable if submitted in a separate, t | timely filed amendmer | t canceling the |
| Tor purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) [how the new or amended claims would be rejected is proved. | | I be entered and an e | planation of |
| The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: | ided below of appended. | | |
| Claim(s) allowed: None. | | | |
| Claim(s) objected to: <u>None</u> . Claim(s) rejected: <u>None</u> . | | | |
| Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: 1-4,7-9,12-14,17-2 | 20,23-25,28-30,33-3,57-61 | | |
| AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE | | | |
| The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). | | | |
| The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary | vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea | al and/or appellant fail: | to provide a |
| 10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation | n of the status of the claims after er | ntry is below or attach | ed. |
| REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER 11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but | does NOT place the application in | condition for allowan | ce because: |
| 12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). | DTO/SP/09) Paper No/a) | | |
| 12. ☐ Note the attached information Disclosure Statement(s). 13. ☐ Other: See Continuation Sheet. | PTO/SB/00) Paper No(s). | | |
| /saleh najjar/ | /Thuong T Nguyen/ | | |

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2455

Examiner, Art Unit 2455

Continuation of 13. Other: Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments filed 9/1/09 have been fully considered, however they are not persuasive because of the following reasons:
2. Applicant argues in substance that: A) with respect to claims 1, 17, 33, 8.57, Moulden, Caswell and Jorapur do not teach the claimed limitation of "wherein the checksuit includes first individual checks that are configured to monitor parameters of a first operating system and second individual checks that are configured to monitor parameters of a second operating system" (page 11, paragraph 3); B) with respect to claims 1, 17, 33, 8.57, Moulden does not teach the claimed limitation of "simultaneously applying an edited checksuite to the first machine that includes a first operating system and a second machine that includes a second operating system" (page 13, paragraph 1).

In response to A); Moulden, Caswell and Jorapur do teach the claimed limitation of "wherein the checks that includes first individual checks that are configured to monitor parameters of a first operating system and second individual checks that are configured to monitor parameters of a second operating system" (Moulden, figure 9; figure 15-16; figure 29; page 3, paragraph 47; page 4, paragraph 53; page 6, paragraph 47; expected to the paragraph 72; exp

In response to B); Moulden, Caswell and Jorapur do teach the claimed limitation of "simultaneously applying an edited checksuite to the first machine that includes a first operating system and a second machine that includes a second operating system" (Moulden, page 4, paragraph 51 & 53; page 5, paragraph 52; page 6, paragraph 72; page 9, paragraph 98-100; i.e., simultaneously running the modified test suite on selected machines). Moreover, Moulden discloses the method of running the two versions of the integrated testing applications concurrently on two different systems. Therefore, Moulden, Caswell and Jorapur meet the claim limitation.